



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,293	12/01/2003	Werner Beck	P02,0627-01	2944

7590 06/28/2006

SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

ARTMAN, THOMAS R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2882

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/725,293	BECK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas R. Artman	2882	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thomas R. Artman. (3)_____.

(2) Mark Bergner, Reg. No. 45,877. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 22 June 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 5.


Identification of prior art discussed: Ono (US 6,088,425) and Cecil (US 4,991,193).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


EDWARD J. GLICK
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Counsel put forth the argument that Ono and Cecil are not combinable for the reasons that Ono teaches and prefers a highly automated CT imaging system, where there is no incentive for providing an override feature; the disclosure of Ono is not directed at operator control but full utilization of the CT system through automation. Counsel further argued that the timer of Ono represents a different function than that of Cecil, and as a result, providing an override as taught by Cecil would not be obvious. The examiner disagreed on both points, stating first that both Ono and Cecil are automated CT systems, where overrides in general are known and essential to safe operation. Second, the examiner agreed that the timers of Ono and Cecil are not identical; however, the examiner argued that the timers are analogous, since each represent direct control of the X-ray tube as a function of preventing thermal overload. Therefore, if it is taught to override a thermal overload timer in order to facilitate saving the life of the patient, as it is in Cecil, then it would have been obvious to override similar thermal overload timers, such as that of Ono. No agreement was reached.

SPS 6/22/06